

Minutes for October 18, 2007

Regional Bike Working Group meeting, MTC

1. **Introductions:** See attached for sign-in sheet. Along with the usual assortment of public agency staff and bike advocates, there were three students from an Urban Transportation course at San Francisco State University in attendance.
2. **August meeting minutes:** Clarifications: Celia's last name is Chung. The Bike Mapper project was funded through an Air District grant that the San Francisco Dept. of Environment secured.
3. **Review of the Regional Bicycle Plan (RBP) draft chapters:**
The draft 10/11/07 RBP chapters were distributed via Internet before the meeting. Victoria Eisen of Eisen/Letunic reviewed the schedule and the content of the current draft.

Schedule

Comments are due by October 26 to Sean Co of MTC and Victoria in order to incorporate them for the final draft RBP to be reviewed at the December RBWG meeting, in order to be incorporated into the Regional Transportation Plan that MTC is updating.

Content:

Victoria explained that while this was supposed to be a minor update of the RBP, this draft contained some sections that were significantly altered or new. Some sections are still placeholders. Also, the formatting and photos insertions would be done after the text content was mostly completed.

The draft RBP will be reviewed not only by the RBWG, but also MTC, Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) and transit agencies.

Appendix A, which inventories the unbuilt sections of the Regional Bike Network (RBN), is the most onerous section to update, since the data is collected inconsistently, and is transmitted through three levels (cities, CMAs and MTC). (It was last updated by MTC staff in 2004) The RBN data also been found to be inconsistent with Bikemapper; updated RBN data will be reconciled with Bikemapper.

(All numbering referenced below are for the 10/11/07 version of the draft RBP)

MTC staff provided some comments on the Goals and Objectives after the current draft was released, most of which diluted MTC's level of obligation for carrying out the stated Goals and Policies (pp 6 – 9). Sean explained that this was because the MTC Commissioners had not previously adopted/committed to these obligations, nor funding for them. See attached for details. (get a copy of Sean's comments)

The group discussed MTC staff's proposed changes to the Goals and Policies, and Sean agreed have other MTC managers review them.
MTC staff proposed ~~deletions~~ and *new language*

Objectives:

~~3.3 Assemble examples of bike facility maintenance standards.~~ - The RBWG did not reach consensus.

~~4.4 Sponsor~~ Provide training sessions on best practices bicycle facility design and safe cycling practices. - RBWG concurred

~~4.5 Develop~~ Investigate development of a regional bicycle signage program - RBWG concurred

5.4 Continue to fund the Safe Routes to Transit program using Regional Measure 2 revenue or other sources. – Group concurred, but asked that the goal be to try expand the program.

7.1 Renew and increase the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Grant Program to support

improvements to, and expansion, ~~maintenance, and operation~~ of bicycle facilities throughout the Bay Area.

7.3 – Continue funding the Safe Routes to Transit program with alternate funds once Regional Measure 2 funds are no longer available. - This objective seemed to duplicate objective 5.4, and the phrasing implied that RM2 funding would go away.

9.1 Conduct regional travel surveys every ~~five~~ ten years to understand the role that bicycling

plays in the Bay Area's transportation system and to track the effect of external trends.

9.2 was to be reworded based on Victoria's proposed language

9.3 Encourage Caltrans to ~~P~~purchase a regional add on to the National Household Travel Survey.

9.5 Encourage local jurisdictions to wWork with the National Bicycle and Pedestrian Documentation Project to standardize bicycle and pedestrian data collection throughout the region.

~~9.6 Establish a program that provides consultants to perform bicycle counts to public agencies throughout the Bay Area, including transit systems. Ensure that funding does not come from bicycle funding sources.~~ – Group concurred

The following were comments from the entire group:

Table 3.1 (p.12) – Sabrina Merlo asked the year of the data collection be listed.

Autos/bike collisions (p.13) Andy Thornley asked to include language that SWITRs data was usually under-reported. Rochelle Wheeler asked about San Francisco's attempt to correlate hospital reports with SWITRs to redress under-reporting in collision data. Sabrina asked to include percentage of fatalities that were cyclists. Victoria explained that there were two sources of data used for this section, Bay Area Travel Survey (BATS) and Journey to Work Data (JTWD). Michelle DeRobertis said that the Alameda County Bike Plan stats were derived from the MTC model which was based on BATS data. Andy pointed out that some incidents involving 'solo' cyclists are actually a result of bad pavement/ potholes, and asked if that data could be called out in the RBP.

Countywide Plans (p. 15 -19). There were no substantial comments.

Bike Access to Transit (p. 20 – 24)

Only the top ten (instead of eight) transit agencies were interviewed/surveyed for this section.

Mike Gougherty asked that BART's 'Bike Access Plan' be listed in Table 3.4

Sarah Woo asked that there be consistent usage of the phrase "transit operator" or "transit agency" (pick one), and asked that the text emphasize that not all Bay Area transit agencies were included in the discussion. Eric Schatmeier asked for clarifications about the Capitol Corridor (he used to work there); since some of the data conflicted with his knowledge.

Michelle clarified that VTA's Bike Plan was for the CMA/cities, rather than for the transit agency,

MTC Bike-Related Programs (p. 25)

Michelle asked that MTC should highlight the TDA3 policies that require local jurisdictions to require bike plans and Bike Advisory Committees before getting TDA3 funding.

New Technologies (p. 26-30)

Victoria is looking for input beyond bike parking. Someone mentioned that this section seemed very transit oriented, and some parts of it could be placed in the Existing Conditions section.

Andy suggested including discussion about embedded bike counters.

Someone suggested including discussion on bike detection (traffic signals)

Opportunities and Constraints (p. 31 -33)

Andy suggested adding "To implement principle goals."

Sabrina suggested adding that the current positive political climate was an opportunity.

Op 11: Mike suggested changing the term "Bay Area's economic wealth" to something more relevant to the context.

Con 2: Someone suggested changing " limited ROW" to "built-out cities"

Sabrina asked that flow chart showing the funding flow for bike projects be included. (in Costs and Revenue section p. 35)

Victoria reiterated the request for comments, preferably marked up on the draft RBP pages, scanned as pdf and emailed to her, but she would take them anyway people submitted them. Sean agreed to send an email reminder to the group reminding them to send comments closer to the deadline.

4. Bikemapper Demo

? (name? woman with glasses and straight dark hair) on MTC's GIS staff gave a demo of the BikeMapper software. The look is based on the Reineck San Francisco Bike Map. It currently covers only San Francisco and a small part of Marin County. It will be posted on the 511 bike website. Eventually it will be expanded for the rest of the Bay Area, but without as many features, such as flattest route or cyclist experience. The initial grant funded portion of the software for San Francisco set up the structure, which can easily be populated, as data becomes available. Someone asked about how updates (i.e. new bike lanes) would be done. Some of the RBN data being updated for the RBP could be fed into BikeMapper. Michelle asked if it would provide turn-by-turn directions would be available. (yes?)

5. T2035

Sean updated the group on MTC's T2035 process and schedule.

6. Other Announcements

The last of MTC's ped/bike workshops will be held on Nov 7 in Oakland. Space is still available.

The e-locker meeting will be held at 3:15 PM after this meeting.

The next RBWG meeting will be held on Thursday Dec 13 (which is the second, not third Thursday of the month)